

1 The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was *not*  
2 written for publication and is *not* binding precedent of the Board.  
3

4  
5 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
6

7  
8 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
9 AND INTERFERENCES  
10

11  
12 *Ex parte* PAUL LEVY WILLIAMS Jr. and MARCELLOUS P. FRYE Jr.  
13

14  
15 Appeal 2007-0774  
16 Application 09/741,994  
17 Technology Center 3600  
18

19  
20 Decided: April 20, 2007  
21

22  
23 Before TERRY J. OWENS, MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, and ROBERT E. NAPPI  
24 *Administrative Patent Judges.*  
25

26 NAPPI, *Administrative Patent Judge.*  
27

28  
29 DECISION ON APPEAL  
30

31 This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002) of the final  
32 rejection of claims 1 through 28. For the reasons stated *infra* we will not sustain  
33 the Examiner's rejection of these claims.  
34  
35

INVENTION

The invention is directed to a method of providing Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) products and services. The method involves providing a user of EDI products access to a server which prompts the user to enter data relating to the user's trading partners. Based upon the responses the server automatically determines the appropriate EDI products and services that the user needs. See pages 2 and 3 of Appellants' specification. Claim 1 is representative of the invention and reproduced below:

1. A method for providing electronic commerce electronic data interchange (EDI) products and services for EDI between a user and one or more trading partners, the method comprising the steps of:  
    providing a host server for access by said user;  
    obtaining first information from said user to identify a plurality of selected trading partners for exchanging EDI information related to trading with the selected trading partners;  
    retrieving requirements information relating to predetermined electronic commerce EDI requirements of said selected trading partners;  
    automatically determining, by the host server, suitable electronic commerce EDI products or services for said user based at least in part on said requirements information from said selected trading partners; and  
    obtaining registration information from said user to register said user for one or more of said suitable EDI products or services.

REFERENCES

The references relied upon by the Examiner are:

Reed	US 5,862,325	Jan 19, 1999
Call	US 5,913,210	Jun. 15, 1999

Archived web page "www.ediconsulting.com" dated October 14, 1999.

Bakalash US 6,408,292 Jun. 18, 2002

#### REJECTION AT ISSUE

Claims 1, 2, 10, 13-16, 19, 20, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 102 (a) as being anticipated by “www.ediconsulting.com.” The Examiner’s rejection is set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Final Office action mailed March 4, 2006. Claims 3 through 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 21 through 23, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) unpatentable over “www.ediconsulting.com” in view of Call, Reed, and Bakalash . The Examiner’s rejection is set forth on pages 3 and 4 of the Final Office action mailed March 4, 2006. Throughout the opinion we make reference to the Brief and Reply Briefs (received November 17, 2005, June 21, 2006 and July 17, 2006 respectively), and the Answer (mailed April 21, 2006) for the respective details thereof.

#### ISSUES

Appellants contend that the Examiner’s rejection of independent claims 1, 19, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is in error. Appellants assert that www.ediconsulting.com does not disclose or suggest automated determination by a host server of EDI products and services that are needed to perform EDI with selected trading partners. Rather, Appellants assert that www.ediconsulting.com teaches performing EDI evaluations, mapping support and ongoing support for EDI system integration all of which are manual operations. (Br. 4)

The Examiner asserts that the rejection is proper. The Examiner, on pages 4 and 5 of the Answer asserts that the claim term “automatic” when viewed in light of the specification does not mean “fully automatic” but rather requires some input.

1 The Examiner finds that the www.ediconsulting.com web site obtains information  
2 from the user, retrieves user information from a database relating to the EC/EDI  
3 requirements. Further the Examiner states “[t]he ediconsulting.com site is silent as  
4 to precisely how it determines suitable EC/EDI products, but it must use an  
5 automated and interactive process using a database of rule and trade partners and  
6 the internet.”

7 Thus, the issue before us is whether www.ediconsulting.com teaches  
8 automatically determining, by the host server, suitable electronic commerce EDI  
9 products or services for said user.

#### 10 FINDINGS OF FACT

11 Appellants’ specification describes a system where a user inputs information  
12 identifying trading partners to a host server. Based upon the inputted information a  
13 database is queried, the results of the query providing information identifying the  
14 appropriate EDI products and services to trade with the identified partners.  
15 (Appellants’ specification P. 6, ll. 20-28 and P. 9, ll. 3-16). If there is insufficient  
16 information in the database the user is referred to a call center where the  
17 determination is made by a person. (Appellants’ specification P. 10, ll. 9-18)  
18 Thus, the Appellants’ specification describes one operation of the system involves  
19 a determination made by a host server in response to user input, i.e. once the user  
20 inputs the data the host server (a computer) makes the determination. As such we  
21 consider the scope of the term automatically to be referring to a system that  
22 responds to a user input without further user action.

23 We find that the www.ediconsulting.com document cited by the Examiner is  
24 a web based advertisement for services of the company EDI consulting. The  
25 Examiner’s rejection appears to be relying upon the document not as description of  
26 the system which performs the claimed method but as evidence of a system on the

1 web that performs the claimed method. Taking the evidence as such, we find that  
2 implicit in a web page is that there is a host web server that contains the web page.  
3 We further find that the web page has a hypertext link titled “consulting services”  
4 (see page 2 of printout), which leads to a page which describes consulting services  
5 provided by the company EDI Consulting (see page 3 of the printout). The  
6 document describes several methods of contacting the company EDI Consulting,  
7 page 2 of the printout provides a mailing address and both voice and fax phone  
8 numbers. Further, page 3 of the printout provides an e-mail address, which  
9 provides some evidence that a user may provide information to the host web  
10 server, although it is not clear if the host web server is the same server as receives  
11 the e-mail. The document provides little information as to how the mapping is  
12 performed. However we find that the statement “ECS maps every day, we can  
13 take this task from the shoulders of your busy internal staff” to suggest that the  
14 mapping is performed by staff consultants.

## 15 16 ANALYSIS

17 Claim 1 recites “automatically determining, by the host server, suitable  
18 electronic commerce EDI products or services for said user based at least in part on  
19 said requirements information from said selected trading partners.” Independent  
20 claims 27 and 28 contain similar limitations; however they are not limited to a host  
21 server. Claim 27 recites a “means for automatically determining” which in light of  
22 the specification is referring to a host computer. Claim 28 recites a computer  
23 program product and includes a “code for automatically determining.”  
24 Independent claim 19 recites “an application for ... retrieving requirements from  
25 said database based in part on said first information, and automatically displaying  
26 suitable electronic commerce EDI products or services.” As discussed *supra*, the

1 scope of the term “automatically” is interpreted as a system (in the context of the  
2 claims is a host server or computer) responding to a user input without further  
3 information. Thus, each of the independent claims 1, 19, 27, and 28 require a host  
4 server (or computer code or application) to determine the appropriate EDI  
5 products, based in part on information input by the user. As discussed *supra* we  
6 find that the web page [www.ediconsulting.com](http://www.ediconsulting.com) cited by the Examiner is an  
7 advertisement for consulting services that are performed by consultants (people).  
8 We do not find that the web page [www.ediconsulting.com](http://www.ediconsulting.com) cited by the Examiner  
9 provides evidence of either a host server, computer code or application, which  
10 automatically provides the information concerning EDI products to a user based in  
11 part upon information provided to the host server, computer code or application.  
12 Thus, we do not find that the web page [www.ediconsulting.com](http://www.ediconsulting.com) cited by the  
13 Examiner provides evidence that the limitations of independent claims 1, 19, 27,  
14 and 28 was known prior to Appellants’ invention.

## CONCLUSION

16  
17 We consider the Examiner’s rejection of 1, 2, 10, 13-16, 19, 20, 27, and 28  
18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) to be in error as we do not find that web page  
19 [www.ediconsulting.com](http://www.ediconsulting.com) cited by the Examiner anticipates the limitations in  
20 independent claims 1, 19, 27, and 28. The Examiner has not asserted, nor do we  
21 find that Call, Reed, and Bakalash, the references applied against dependent claims  
22 3 through 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 21 through 23, 25, and 26 makes up for the noted  
23 deficiencies in the rejection of independent claims 1, 19, 27, and 28. Accordingly  
24 we will not sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) of  
25 claims 3 through 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 21 through 23, 25, and 26.

ORDER

For the forgoing reasons, we will not sustain the Examiner's rejections,  
under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The decision of the Examiner is  
reversed.

REVERSED

JRG

Appeal 2007-0774  
Application 09/741,994

E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY  
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER  
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128  
4417 LANCASTER PIKE  
WILMINGTON, DE 19805